

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-29 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 22-29 have been added to provide Applicant additional scope of coverage duly supported by the disclosure. Claim 10 has been amended merely to add a missing period at the end of the claim. Claims 1-21 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pepe et al. (USP 5,742,905). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests favorable disposition of the application.

***The Claimed Invention***

The invention disclosed and claimed in the present application is generally directed to a portable terminal system that permits a user of the portable terminal to connect to a network, such as the Internet, and retrieve and review desired data from a server of the network on the portable terminal. More specifically, the claimed invention provides novel features related to ease of use of the portable terminal and, thus, easier data retrieval. In particular, the portable terminal receives data that has been segregated by an information source server into at least two different distinct categories. These two categories of data include information, or content, data that is referred to as "text content", and operation procedure data which is referred to as "help content".

Segregation of the data into the above-mentioned two categories enables the portable terminal to provide unique features to terminal users. For example, when help content associated with particular text content is received by the portable terminal a display processor and an input

processor, each specifically designated to handle help content, process the data and control the portable terminal to provide assistance to the terminal user in retrieving and analyzing the text content. Certain unique features, such as back-lighting or vibrating certain input keys and/or providing audible or graphic commands to the user, are activated to assist the user and provide for easier retrieval of the text content.

In accordance with the disclosed invention, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*;

a server storing text contents which are supposed to be displayed at a display section of a portable terminal, and help contents which show a method of utilizing said text contents; and

a portable terminal including a text browser provided for use in perusing the text contents stored in said server, and a help browser provided for use in perusing the help contents also stored in said server.

***Pepe et al.***

Pepe et al. is directed to a network that permits a mobile communications subscriber to “remotely control the receipt and delivery of wireless and wireline voice and text messages.” (Col. 3, lines 47-48). The network “operates as an interface between various wireless and wireline networks, and also performs media translation, where necessary.” (Col. 3, lines 49-52).

Fig. 1 shows a PCI network 40 connected between a wireless network 39 and a wireline network 29. According to Pepe et al., PCI network 40 permits the mobile communications subscriber to “receive e-mail, fax, pages, and voice messages under a single phone number while using either a wireless or wireline network.” (Col. 5, lines 60-62). Also, the subscriber can

“select the media format and serving network used to receive messages” (Col. 5, lines 62-64) and “select cross-media notification of incoming messages, (i.e., the subscriber may receive notification from a pager message that a voice mail message was received). (Col. 5, lines 64-67).

Thus, as disclosed in Pepe et al., by utilizing the PCI network placed between separate wireline and wireless networks, messages sent to and from a mobile subscriber can be translated into different formats and routed accordingly in accordance with a selection made by the mobile subscriber. In this manner, if the mobile subscriber wishes, for example, that his e-mail communications that are usually delivered to his office PC to be routed to his cellular telephone, the PCI network according to Pepe et al. receives the e-mail data from the wireline network connected to the office PC and translates the data into a format that can be transmitted onto the wireless network connected to the subscriber's cellular telephone. The PCI network then transmits the translated data onto the wireless network and the subscriber can then receive the e-mail message remotely on his/her cellular telephone.

Pepe et al. does not teach, or even suggest, a server that stores both text and help contents or a portable terminal that has both a text browser and a help browser, as explicitly recited in claim 1.

***Claims 1 and 10***

Server

In the grounds of rejection it is asserted that Pepe et al. discloses the claimed server of claim 1 in PCI server 48 shown in Fig. 5. In particular, it is asserted that PCI server 48

“inherently shows help contents which show a method of utilizing said text contents because any PDA may also select the media format and serving network used to receive messages, which could be a e-mail message with commands to execute a task or a software in PDA . . . by setting up a ‘subscriber profile’”. However, nowhere in Pepe et al. is it disclosed that a PDA receives e-mail messages “with commands to execute a task or software.” The assertion to the contrary is unsupported by the actual disclosure of Pepe et al. or any other prior art of record.

Furthermore, a ‘subscriber profile’, as disclosed in Pepe et al. is not the same as the recited “help contents” stored in the server of claim 1. Specifically, a ‘subscriber profile’, as disclosed in Pepe et al. contains,

service related information for mapping services to subscribers (e.g., screening, routing, terminal selection by subscriber selected parameters, custom calling features, and the like); subscriber authentication data (e.g., password and user I.D.); user status (registered or not registered); generic service profile for non-call associated service, such as subscriber address or social security number; specific profile for a non-call service (based on subscriber selected parameters); wireless data providers identification (e.g., what cellular phone provider is used); and specific profile for call associated services (e.g., call forwarding), based on user selected parameters.

(Col. 7, lines 5-15)

None of the data included in the disclosed ‘subscriber profile’ meet the requirements of claim 1 or claim 10 which include “help contents which show a method of utilizing said text contents.” Accordingly, because Pepe et al. does not disclose the claimed “help contents”, Pepe et al. does not, and can not, disclose, either explicitly or inherently, a server that stores “help

contents.” For at least this reason, Pepe et al. does not teach or suggest all the claimed features of claims 1 and 10 and the §102 rejection based on Pepe et al. should be withdrawn.

Portable Terminal

Additionally, Pepe et al. does not teach or suggest a portable terminal with both a text browser and a help browser. It is asserted, in the grounds of rejection, that the PDA disclosed in Pepe et al. meets all the claimed requirements of the recited portable terminal of claim 1 or claim 10. Specifically, it is asserted that features such as “Call Command” and “message and forward” or “message only” satisfy the recited “text browser” and that the “help browser” is *inherently* disclosed by Figs. 41-45 by software that enables the PDA to create or modify the ‘subscriber profile’. However, as described above, the ‘subscriber profile’ of Pepe et al. is completely different from the “help content” of the claimed invention.

Additionally, and more fundamentally, contrary to the assertions in the grounds of rejection, Pepe et al. does not disclose that the PDA can create or modify the ‘subscriber profile’. Therefore, even if the ‘subscriber profile’ were similar to the claimed “help content”, which it is not, the PDA of Pepe et al. does not have a browser for perusing the content of that data, as required by the claim. Accordingly, Pepe et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed portable terminal. For this additional reason, Pepe et al. does not disclose all the claimed features of claims 1 and 10 and, thus, neither claim 1 nor claim 10 are anticipated by Pepe et al. and the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under §102 should be withdrawn.

***Claims 2-9 and 11-17***

Claims 2-9 and 11-17 depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 10, claims 2-9 and 11-17 are neither anticipated by nor otherwise rendered obvious by the disclosure of Pepe et al. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-9 and 11-17 should be withdrawn.

***Claims 3 and 11***

In addition to their dependency on claims 1 and 10, claims 3 and 11 recite subject matter that is independently patentable over Pepe et al. because Pepe et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed judging means. The recited judging means determines whether an inputted message is a text message or a help message. Based on this determination, either the text browser or the help browser is activated.

In addition to generally failing to disclose “help content”, as discussed above, Pepe et al. does not disclose a means, especially not one within a portable terminal, that determines which of two browsers should be selected. The passages cited by the Examiner, i.e., col. 14, lines 53-67 and col. 15, lines 1-15, disclose a ‘subscriber profile’ downloaded from the PCI database to the PCI server and how the ‘subscriber profile’ is managed in segments due to its size. There is simply no discussion of any means for determining which of two browsers to activate within the portable device. For this additional reason, claims 3 and 11 are patentable over the cited prior art.

***Claims 4 and 12***

In addition to their dependency on claims 1 and 10, respectively, claims 4 and 12 recite subject matter that is independently patentable over Pepe et al. because Pepe et al. fails to teach or suggest a help browser within a portable terminal that *outputs text, voice, static images, moving images, or any combination of such representation formats*.

The cited passage from Pepe et al. discloses that the PCI network is placed between a wireline network and a wireless network and enables the subscriber to remotely control delivery of *voice and text* messages. There is no mention whatsoever of static images or moving images. For this additional reason, claims 4 and 12 are patentable over the cited prior art.

***Claims 5-7 and 13-15***

In addition to their dependency on claims 1 and 10, respectively, claims 5-7 and 13-15 recite subject matter that is independently patentable over Pepe et al. because Pepe et al. fails to teach or suggest switch keys on a portable terminal that can be set to either an effective state or a non-effective state based on the contents of help content.

The grounds of rejection assert that the disclosed PDA of Pepe et al. “would provide a plurality of switch keys”, as claimed. To support this assertion, the Examiner has referred generally to Figs. 28-43. However, there is nothing within the cited figures that supports the assertion that any switch keys on the disclosed PDA in Pepe et al. can be rendered effective or non-effective, let alone rendered effective or non-effective based on help content within a

controlling means. For this additional reason, claims 5-7 and 13-15 are patentable over the cited prior art.

***Claims 8, 9, 16 and 17***

In addition to their respective dependencies, claims 8, 9, 16 and 17 recite subject matter that is independently patentable over Pepe et al. because Pepe et al. fails to teach or suggest a switch- key that is either lit-up or not, or that vibrates or not, based on whether the switch-key is in an effective state or a non-effective state.

The Examiner refers to a passage in Pepe et al. where it is disclosed that the PDA could be a cellular phone or a pager. However, regardless of the form of the portable device, Pepe et al. does not disclose, either explicitly or implicitly, that switch-keys are lit-up or vibrate depending upon their respective effective or non-effective state. For this additional reason, claims 8, 9, 16 and 17 are patentable over the cited prior art.

***Claims 18 and 20***

As discussed previously, Pepe et al. does not disclose controlling a portable terminal by judging whether a message is a text or a help message. Furthermore, Pepe et al. does not disclose selectively activating a text browser or help browser based on the non-existent judgement of the message. Instead, Pepe et al. discloses a 'subscriber profile' in a network server where the profile is updated based on selections made by the user of the portable device. Accordingly, Pepe et al. does not anticipate either claim 18 or claim 20 and the rejection of these two claims should be withdrawn.



***Claims 19 and 21***

In addition to their dependency on claims 18 and 20, respectively, claims 19 and 21 recite independently patentable subject matter. Similar to claims 4 and 12, claims 19 and 21 recite outputting *text, voice, static images, moving images, or any combination of such representation formats* from a portable terminal. There is no mention whatsoever of static images or moving images in Pepe et al. For this additional reason, claims 19 and 21 are patentable over the cited prior art.

***New Claims 22-29***

For additional claim coverage merited by the scope of the invention, Applicant has added new claims 22-29. Applicant submits that the prior art does not disclose, teach, or suggest the combination of features contained therein.


***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in form for immediate allowance with claims 1-29 and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to **contact the undersigned attorney** at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/680,479

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kevin M. Barner  
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: February 21, 2003

Attorney Docket No.: Q61026

## **APPENDIX**

### **VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

#### **IN THE CLAIMS:**

**The claims are amended as follows:**

10. (Amended) A portable terminal comprising:

a text browser provided for use in perusing text contents which are supposed to be displayed at a display section of the portable terminal; and

a help browser provided for use in perusing help contents which show a method of utilizing said text contents.

**Claims 22-29 are added as new claims.**